

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-8, 12, 16, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,160,796 (hereinafter "Zou") in view of U.S. Patent No 5,655,081 (hereinafter "Bonnell").

Claim 1, as amended, includes a limitation of adding a request to a list of requests for notification, and storing parameters of the request. Claim 1 includes a limitation not taught or suggested by Zou or Bonnell. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Zou and Bonnell. Specifically, claim 1 includes a limitation similar to that of the now cancelled claim 2. The Examiner has already admitted that Zou and Bonnell do not teach such a limitation. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 will now be discussed with regards to the combination of Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz.

Stutz teaches where a source object raises or recognizes an event and notifies a sink object (Col. 9, lines 4-14). The purpose of notification is to allow the sink object to begin handling a specific event; the source object directs the event to the sink object for handling (Col. 9, lines 8-11). The sink object and the source object are connected using a connection interface (Col. 13, lines 60-65, Figure 6). The connection interfaces are set up using pointers to direct a notification from the source object to the sink object (Col. 15, lines 49-57). Stutz teaches where connections are made between objects so that events can be handled, and that a sink object is notified when an event needs to be handled.

The sink object receives notification of any event that is generated by the source object. Therefore, Stutz does not teach adding a request to a list of requests for notification, nor does Stutz teach a list of requests for notification. Rather, Stutz teaches a connected source and sink object to direct and handle an event. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz.

Further, claim 1 includes a limitation of storing parameters of the request and notifying the client requesting notification according to the parameters that the specific change in the system occurred. Stutz does not teach such a limitation. Instead, as noted above, Stutz teaches where an event is recognized by a source object and directed to a sink object. The sink object is notified of the event, although this is only so that the sink object may invoke an appropriate method for handling the event (Col. 9, lines 12-14). Therefore, the event itself determines how the sink object will handle the event, and Stutz does not teach storing parameters of the request, as in claim 1.

Independent claims 8, 12, and 16 have been amended to include the limitations discussed above. Therefore, for the same reasons as noted with regard to claim 1, claims 8, 12, and 16 are also patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz.

Claims 5-8 depend from claim 1. Claims 5-8 therefore include the limitations of claim 1. Since claim 1 is patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz, claims 5-8 are also patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz. Claims 24-26 depend from claim 21, which will be discussed below. Since claims 24-26 include the limitations of claim 21, and claim 21 is patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz, claims 24-26 are also patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz.

Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zou in view of Bonnell as applied to claims 1, 5-8, 12, 16, 21 and 24-26 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,617 (hereinafter "Stutz").

Claims 2, 9, 13, and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18-20 depend from the above discussed independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 16. Therefore, claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18-20 include the limitations of claims 1, 8, 12, and 16. Since claims 1, 8, 12, and 16 are patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz, claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18-20 are also patentable over Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz.

Examiner rejected claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zou in view of Bonnell, as applied to claims 1, 5-8, 12, 16, 21, and 24-26 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,311,242 (hereinafter "Falkenburg").

Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-8, 12, 16, 21, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zou and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,195 (hereinafter "Hudis").

Claims 1, 8, 12, 16, and 21 have been amended to include a limitation similar to that of the now cancelled claim 2. The Examiner admits that Zou and Hudis do not include such a limitation, and therefore claims 1, 8, 12, 16, and 21 will be discussed with regards to the combination of Zou, Hudis, and Stutz. For the same reasons as above, regarding claim 1 in light of the combination of Zou, Bonnell, and Stutz, claims 1, 8, 12, 16, and 21 are patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Stutz.

Claims 5-8, and 24-26 depend from claims 1 and 21, and therefore include the limitations of claims 1 and 21. Since claims 1 and 21 are patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Stutz, claims 5-8 and 24-26 are also patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Stutz.

Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 9-11 13-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zou and in view of Hudis as applied to claims 1, 5-8, 12, 16, 21 and 24-26 above, and further in view of Stutz.

Claims 2, 9, 13, and 17 have been canceled. The remaining claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18-20 depend from the above discussed claims 1, 8, 12, and 16, and therefore include the limitations of those claims. Since claims 1, 8, 12, and 16 are patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Stutz, claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15, and 18-20 are also patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Stutz.

Examiner rejected claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Zou and in view of Hudis as applied to claims 1, 5-8, 12, 16, 21 and 24-26 above and further in view of Falkenburg.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21, and therefore include the limitations of claim 21. Since claim 21 is patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Stutz, claims 22 and 23 are also patentable over Zou, Hudis, and Falkenburg.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen M. Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: July 1, 2003



Arlen M. Hartounian
Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300